Snell & Wilmer  LAW OFFICES  3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100  Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 702.784.5200	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA  Case No. 2:20-cv-02340-CDS-MDC STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL AND ORDER
---	--	--	---

Plaintiff Andrew Turesky ("Plaintiff"), Nominal Defendant Las Vegas Sands Corp.
("LVSC"), and Defendants Dr. Miriam Adelson, in her capacity as Special Administrator of the
estate of Sheldon G. Adelson, Patrick Dumont, Robert G. Goldstein, Irwin Chafetz, Micheline
Chau, Charles D. Forman, Steven L. Gerard, George Jamieson, Charles A. Koppelman, Lewis
Kramer, and David F. Levi (the "Individual Defendants," together with LVSC, the "Defendants"),
by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, on December 28, 2020, Plaintiff filed this stockholder derivative action on behalf of Nominal Defendant LVSC alleging violations of the federal securities laws and breaches of fiduciary duty (the "Derivative Action");

WHEREAS, in his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges, among other things, that the Individual Defendants breached their fiduciary duties by making and/or causing LVSC to make false and misleading statements, and by causing and/or allowing conduct that was the subject of the alleged misstatements, and thereby subjected LVSC to damages, including potential liability in a putative class action filed a few months earlier, *The Daniels Family 2001 Revocable Trust v. Las Vegas Sands Corp.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-01958 (D. Nev.) (the "Securities Action"), which involved allegations substantially similar to those made in the Derivative Action;

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2021, the parties to the Derivative Action filed a joint stipulation to stay the Derivative Action (including all discovery) until 30 days after the final resolution of the motion to dismiss in the Securities Action (ECF No. 12);

WHEREAS, on February 24, 2021, Judge Gordon granted the joint stipulation and stayed the Derivative Action (ECF No. 14);

WHEREAS, on March 28, 2022, the motion to dismiss the amended complaint in the Securities Action was granted in its entirety (ECF No. 74), and plaintiffs in the Securities Action filed a second amended complaint on April 18, 2022 (ECF No. 77);

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2023, the motion to dismiss the second amended complaint in the Securities Action was granted in part and denied in part (ECF No. 108), and defendants in the Securities Action moved for partial reconsideration on August 22, 2023 (ECF No. 109);

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

WHEREAS, on January 2, 2024, the court issued an amended order, dismissing the second amended complaint in the Securities Action in its entirety (ECF No. 147);

WHEREAS, on February 26, 2024, the Securities Action was dismissed with prejudice (ECF No. 152), and final judgment was entered on February 27, 2024 (ECF No. 153), placing the deadline for plaintiffs in the Securities Action to file a notice of appeal of the final judgment at March 28, 2024;

WHEREAS, on February 27, 2024, the Court lifted the stay in this Derivative Action and ordered the parties to meet and confer and submit a proposed scheduling order by March 12, 2024 (ECF No. 33);

WHEREAS, the parties in this Derivative Action agreed that, before submitting a proposed scheduling order, it would be helpful to know whether an appeal would be taken in the Securities Action. Accordingly, on March 8, 2024, the parties in this Derivative Action submitted a Stipulation and Proposed Order requesting an extension on their deadline to submit a proposed scheduling order to April 11, 2024 (ECF No. 34), which the Court granted on March 13, 2024 (ECF No. 35);

WHEREAS, on March 28, 2024, the deadline to appeal the dismissal in the Securities Action expired, no appeal was taken, and the judgment in the Securities Action is now final;

WHEREAS, the parties in this Derivative Action met and conferred regarding next steps in this Action, and discussed Defendants' position that Plaintiff's claims lack viability and should be dismissed, including because of the dismissal of the Securities Action;

WHEREAS, following careful consideration of the circumstances, including the dismissal with prejudice of the Securities Action, Plaintiff agreed to voluntarily dismiss this Derivative Action without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 41(a) and 23.1(c);

WHEREAS, no notice of the voluntary dismissal to stockholders is required or warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.1(c) because there is: (i) no settlement or compromise involved; (ii) no collusion among the parties; (iii) no payment made to any party or their counsel; (iv) no preclusive effect on any other action or stockholder to pursue claims due to the voluntary nature of the dismissal; and (v) because this dismissal is without prejudice;